



## **SPECIAL BOARD MEETING AGENDA**

October 28, 2021 | 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

REMOTE ACCESS ONLY MEETING

**By Video:**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83269256318?pwd=Q3o0Z0Y4eVdjajVLU1JBc01HWUJ1Zz09>

**By Phone:** Dial In: 1 (669) 900-9128 | Meeting ID: 832 692 56318 | Password: 815290

**\*\*\*GOVERNOR'S EXECUTIVE ORDER N-25-20\*\*\***

**\*\*\*GOVERNOR'S EXECUTIVE ORDER N-29-20\*\*\***

**\*\*RE CORONAVIRUS COVID-19\*\***

DUE TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE GOVERNOR'S EXECUTIVE ORDERS N-25-20 AND N-29-20 WHICH SUSPENDS CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS OF THE BROWN ACT, AND THE ORDER OF THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE COUNTY OF SONOMA TO SHELTER IN PLACE TO MINIMIZE THE SPREAD OF COVID-19, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS WILL BE PARTICIPATING BY TELECONFERENCE INTO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING FOR MAY 20, 2021.

Should you want to submit public comment, do so by email before the Board Meeting is called to order. Please state the agenda item number that you are commenting on and limit written comments to three hundred (300) words or less. Comments can be sent to [calvin.sandeen@sonoma-county.org](mailto:calvin.sandeen@sonoma-county.org). Written comments received prior to the meeting you wish to comment on will be read into the record.

### **1. CALL TO ORDER 3:34 pm**

CONSISTENT WITH THE PROVISIONS OF AB 361, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS WILL PARTICIPATE IN THE OCTOBER 27, 2021 MEETING BY TELECONFERENCE. IN-PERSON PARTICIPATION BY THE PUBLIC WILL NOT BE PERMITTED AND NO PHYSICAL LOCATION FROM WHICH THE PUBLIC MAY ATTEND THE MEETING WILL BE AVAILABLE. REMOTE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION DETAILS ARE LISTED AT THE TOP OF THIS AGENDA.

Should you want to submit public comment, do so by email before the Board Meeting is called to order. Please state the agenda item number that you are commenting on and limit written comments to three hundred (300) words or less. Comments can be sent to [calvin.sandeen@sonomacounty.org](mailto:calvin.sandeen@sonomacounty.org). Written comments received prior to the meeting you wish to comment on will be read into the record.

### **2. ROLL CALL 3:34**

**Present:**

**Mary Anne Petrillo (Chair)**

**Katrina Kessen**

**Paul Garza**

**Lisa Badenfort (Vice-Chair)**

**Robin Bartholow – joined in progress**

**Jeff Kelly**

**Mike Nicholls**

**Paul Castro**

**Absent**

**Jon Frech**

### **3. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC EXPRESSION**



This is an opportunity for any member of the public to briefly address the Board on any matter that does not appear on this agenda and is restricted to matters within the Board's jurisdiction. Items that appear to warrant a more-lengthy presentation or Board consideration may be placed on the agenda for discussion at a future meeting. Please limit comments to three hundred (300) words.

-No Public Expression

#### **4. AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS – DISCUSSION/ACTION**

-No Adjustments to Agenda

#### **5. STATEMENT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

This is the time for the Board of Directors to indicate any statements of conflict of interest for any item listed on this agenda.

-No Conflict of Interest

#### **6. 2021 COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CEDs) DRAFT REVIEW**

Project Managers and Ad Hoc Committee

##### **a. SMEDD 2021 CEDs DRAFT\_10.26.21.docx - 3**

Ashleigh – The purpose of this meeting is to look at overall structure and component pieces, schedule, community outreach and connections with priority projects. Look at and evaluate SMEDD's capacity in general and role SMEDD can play in the priority projects.

AK gave a brief review of Table of Contents. Community survey big part of outreach. Community meetings were in person – Padlet platform used to collect feedback, community outreach – whole range of efforts: there were 5 focus groups (4 themed), community survey, 2 community meetings (1 completely in Spanish) and one-on-one interviews (identified projects in appendix D). The projects need to reflect the concerns and vision of the community.

Questions asked in regards to the projects: Is the project of benefit to both counties, does it represent priorities, is it fundable and does it advance equity objectives? Is it actionable given SMEDD's staffing and funding constraints?

Kelly: How did things make the priority list? How was wording chosen?



Castro: Regarding how information was collected – are there more details, business & industry support – page 65 states “we cannot find employees” – What is the detail behind that? What are the challenges? What is behind lack of skill gaps? There is no mention of Sonoma job link or North Bay Workforce Alliance – why?

AK: Paul is referring to the project sheets – these are components that are going to be pulled out of the themes we heard. This will go up for public comment for the next month – we can send edits to Bradley Johnson and there is still time to include.

MAP: The purpose of the meeting today is for the Board to see what is going to be made public. After the 30 days it comes back for edits, reviews, changes – no CEDS gets authorized unless it has Board approval (first two weeks in December) – it is good for the Board to be asking questions.

P Castro: The stakeholders should be part of this conversation – this is all about economic development.

EB: There are quotation style references that don’t come off as appropriate – the points could be general points as part of the outreach. Hopefully there is time to reframe that before it goes public.

Calvin: Would the Board feel more comfortable (i.e. CPUC) – staff proposal on how we want to implement but not formally approved – should we include that in the public draft? Must be clear in our messaging. Not formally approved but what staff believes is in the best position possible.

LB: Note that it’s a balance as well – heavy staff and consultant involvement but this comes out in the Boards name.

JK: How did we get previous stakeholder input? Good understanding of that effort. This document will be widely shared – folks can respond and make comments – needs a clear sense of how to direct people.

AK: How will this be posted?

Bradley Johnson: Email, social media, website, distributed through West Company – in terms of getting feedback – solicited to Brad Johnson’s email directly and posted into a template.

JK: Will there be instructions of what we’re looking for in feedback?

BJ: Yes.

PC: What is today’s purpose?

MAP: The opportunity to weigh in and to make sure you are seeing what is planned to be shared

PC: We would like to have a document that give more answers than questions, how do we create career pathways?

MAP: That would be developed in the projects: articulate the problem to create projects that are solution driven.

Marie Jones: First appendix should be the projects not the last – very important to the community.

MAP – What is local community projects vs SMEDD projects? Regardless of order – that explanation needs to be clear.

AK: SMEDD priority projects vs local community projects – need to be consistent and defined. JK: will we have the survey results included in the draft: AK: yes, JK: in opportunities sections.

AK: SMEDD’s capacity and role: priority projects are a focus on SMEDD’s priorities for the next 5 years. Be realistic about what SMEDD can do and be forward looking – try to not constrain what SMEDD can do.



PG: We should talk about the things that need to be done that people are not aware of and give them the reasons why they need to be done.

PG: These things are all data driven – we need sound data to base our direction upon.

**SMEDD priority projects:**

PG: At end of section on analysis: pull out at the end of a section is not helpful. Relook at those statements in boxes.

PC: They appear to be a recommendation when they're not (page 56) – economic context chapter.

PG: The word “should” is a recommendation. RB thought those were placeholders. EB – need to be less subjective.

PG: The statements are a bit misleading. – interrupts the whole flow of the context of the document. The document lacks flow – it's in sections.

RB: Should we take those out for now and work on them as the document evolves.

PG: We are recommending that these things should be– rephrase it “could focus on”

EB: The narrative isn't a recommendation – we want to tailor that language during the review period.

PG: The comments need to be representative of the data that's presented.

MAP: Can we remove them for now:

EB: Yes – take out of the draft.

MJ: Put key findings from data at the beginning of the chapter

LB: Supports both of those recommendations. Similar issue in SWAT analysis – a lot of common generalizations – there are a few – making a hard time making the connectivity – the rational doesn't come together. Needs to be defensible and understandable. How did these things get here? Does the data point to what we're recommending?

AK: The justification section of each project tries to bring together the reasons for the projects.

JK: Over the next 2 weeks – how much room is there – comments to Bradley – will there be a refurbished draft with feedback for the board meeting?

AK: November No, December yes.

JK: How do we mark our progress?

AK: Will report at the meeting – status update on comments received, adjustment underway.

JK: At the next board meeting maybe have a line item on the agenda,

MAP: Implication boxes really should be a better analysis of the section above – they need to be reworked to be sharper – review at November board meeting. Lisa and Paul are talking about the context – can AK take a review of the whole thing – LB and PG feedback and work on those connections.



AK understands the concern – this is not a linear process. The themes and projects have emerged – AK can try to describe that in the up front section.

LB: Even if we just took community engagement and how we got to projects – important for the community to understand how we got there. How we take the input and get to what we're recommending? We need to be able to explain that.

RB: Thought that's what the CEDS steering committee was participating in.

MAP: We need to see the whole thing together to see the connections. How do we move forward with the information that we have?

PG: Is the issue not the information that was collected but how it was presented?

MAP: It's about how the document flows.

PG: The relationship between the data and the conclusions.

RB: Could it be something as identifiable as a narrative in each section? What data informed in a general level – what was the process.

JK: Maybe at the top there is an orientation paragraph - how to read this document.

### **Board Discussion of SMEDD Capacity & Roles**

Advocate, Incubate, Support and the SMEDD Boards general feeling on terms and how they interact with CEDS priority projects.

Incubate has received mixed feeling as to meaning of word. Implies SMEDD is taking something in and nurturing then releasing it. Would **facilitate** be better word to use?

Support; not easily identified as to the kind of support SMEDD would provide and how the metrics to deliverable items, does **Collaborate** work better?

**Advocate, Collaborate, Facilitate mutually agreed upon as priority words in CEDS as SMEDD Capacity & Roles.**

EB: Rural Densification; meaning. Needs to be generalized, the term will need be generalized as to not provoke negative feedback where density is not so much the goal as much as it is strengthening rural areas. For Mendocino its more zoning/ building planning improvements as opposed to Sonoma County where it means something very different. Needs to be filtered in order for a better representation and not cause disruption within the County whom is reading statements.

### **7. MEETING ADJOURNMENT - ACTION Chair-5:31pm**

**Motion: Paul Garza**

**2<sup>nd</sup>: Mike Nichols**

**ROLL CALL**

**Jon Frech-A**



**Mary Anne Petrillo (Chair)-Y**  
**Katrina Kessen-A**  
**Paul Garza-Y**  
**Lisa Badenfort (Vice-Chair)-Y**  
**Robin Bartholow-A**  
**Jeff Kelly-Y**  
**Mike Nicholls\_Y**  
**Paul Castro-Y**  
***6-0 Motion Passes***

**Certification of Minutes:** These minutes were taken by Robert Gernert, EDFC and are certified as correct

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "Robert Gernert".

